

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully studied the outstanding Office Action. The present amendment is intended to place the application in condition for allowance and is believed to overcome all of the objections and rejections made by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Applicants have amended claims 24 – 26 to more properly claim the present invention. No new matter has been added. Claims 10 – 17, 24 – 26 and 62 – 65 are presented for examination.

In Paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 24 – 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory matter. Applicant has accordingly amended these claims.

In Paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Office Action, claims 10 – 17, 24 – 26 and 62 – 65 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown, U.S. Patent No. 5,794,219 (“Brown”), in view of Walker et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,862,223 (“Walker”).

The rejections of claims 10 – 17, 24 – 26 and 62 – 65 in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Office Action will now be dealt with specifically.

In applicants' previous response and amendment, applicants argued that the limitation in claims 10 and 62 of

“a mechanism module operatively coupled with said interface module, to interactively drive said transaction module so as to perform transactions according to at least one auction rule defined by said mechanism module”

is neither shown nor suggested in Brown and Walker.

Case 23050-09086

It appears to applicants that this limitation is not addressed in Paragraph 6 of the current Office Action. As pointed out in applicants' previous response and amendment, this limitation of a mechanism module enables configurable auction modules to be "plugged into" the on-line transaction system of the present invention, in order to govern the behavior of the system in accordance with custom auction rules.

Because claims 11 – 17 and 24 - 26 depend from claim 10 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 11 – 17 and 24 - 26 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Brown, Walker or a combination of Brown and Walker. Similarly, because claims 63 and 64 depend from claim 62 and include additional features, applicants respectfully submit that claims 63 and 64 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Brown, Walker or a combination of Brown and Walker.

Accordingly claims 10 – 17, 24 - 26 and 62 - 64 are deemed to be allowable.

Similarly, in applicants' previous response and amendment, applicants argued that the limitation in claim 65 of

"admit to each of a subsequent round of bidding a subset of bidders from a previous round responsive to a bid value placed by each of said plurality of bidders, wherein said subset of bidders are assessed a payment in response to being admitted in each subsequent round"

is neither shown nor suggested in Brown and Walker.

In Paragraph 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that Walker discloses bids over a number of rounds. Applicants respectfully submit that Walker does not disclose selection of next-round bidders based on bid values placed. Similarly, Walker

does not disclose bidders being assessed a payment in response to being admitted in a subsequent round.

Accordingly claim 65 is deemed to be allowable.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

PIERFRANCESCA LA MURA, ET AL.

Date: 4/27/06

By: Laura Maj

Laura A. Majerus, Reg. No. 33,417
FENWICK & WEST LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7152
Fax: (650) 938-5200